1 2	Mark A. Ozzello, Esq. (CSB # 116595) Mike Arias, Esq. (CSB #115385) ARIAS, OZZELLO & GIGNAC, LLP 6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1400	CLERK OS CENTROS
.3	Los Angeles, California 90045	OS AND A F
4	Los Angeles, California 90045 Telephone: (310) 670-1600 Facsimile: (310) 670-1231	
5	e-maii (Mark Ozzello): mozzello@aoglip.	Com
6	David Greifinger, Attorney at Law (CSB # 1801 Ocean Park Blvd., Suite 201 Santa Monica, California 90405 Telephone (310) 452-7923 Facsimile (310)	105242)
7	Santa Monica, California 90405 Telephone (310) 452-7923 Facsimile (310)	450-4715
8	e-mail: tracklaw@verizon.net	
9	Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
10		
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
12	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALI	FORNIA—WESTERN DIVISION
13		
14	MIGUEL CALZADA,	CASE NO. 2:11-cv-01701 DMO-JCG
15	Plaintiff,	FIRST AMENDED CLASS-
16	V.	ACTION COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES; DEMAND FOR JURY
17	TIME WARNER CABLE LLC, and DOES 1 through 100, Inclusive,	TRIAL
18	Defendants.	1. Violation of Penal Code section
19		632 DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
20		DEMAND FOR SURT TRIAL
21		
22	<u>PREFACE</u>	
23	All allegations in this complaint are based upon information and belief	
24	except for those allegations that pertain to the named Plaintiff or his counsel.	
25	Plaintiff's information and belief is based upon, inter alia, the investigation	
26	conducted to date by Plaintiff and his counsel. Each allegation in this complaint	
27	either has evidentiary support or is likely to have evidentiary support after a	
28	reasonable opportunity for further investigation and discovery.	
1		

Page 1

THE PARTIES

- 1. PLAINTIFF MIGUEL CALZADA is an individual who resides, and at all relevant times resided in Los Angeles County, California.
- 2. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and alleges that TIME WARNER CABLE LLC ("DEFENDANT") is, and at all relevant times was a Delaware corporation authorized to conduct business, and actually conducting business, in the State of California, and in the Central District of California as Time Warner Cable.
- 3. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, partnership, associate or otherwise of DEFENDANTS Does 1 through 100, inclusive, are unknown to PLAINTIFF who therefore sues these DEFENDANTS by those fictitious names. The CLASS will seek leave to amend this co mplaint to allege the true names and capacities of Does 1 through 100, inclusive, when they are ascertained.
- 4. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that the DEFENDANTS named in this complaint, including Does through 100, inclusive, are responsible in some manner for one or more of the events and happenings that proximately caused the injuries and damages alleged in this complaint.
- 5. PLAINTIFF is informed and believe, and alleges, that each of the DEFENDANTS, including Does 1 through 100, inclusive, in performing or omitting to perform the acts alleged in this complaint, was, at various times, acting within the course and scope of his or her employment, authority, or apparent authority as an employee, agent and/or representative of the other DEFENDANTS.
- 6. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that each DEFENDANT named in this complaint, including Does 1 through 100, inclusive, knowingly and willfully acted in concert, conspired and agreed together among themselves and entered into a combination

and systemized campaign of activity to, *inter alia*, damage the PLAINTIFF CLASS and to otherwise consciously and/or recklessly act in derogation of the PLAINTIFF CLASS' rights, and the trust reposed by the PLAINTIFF CLASS in each of the DEFENDANTS, with the acts being negligently and/or intentionally inflicted. The conspiracy, and DEFENDANTS' concerted actions, were such that, to the PLAINTIFF'S information and belief, and to all appearances, DEFENDANTS, and each of them, represented a unified body so that the actions of one DEFENDANT were accomplished in concert with, and with knowledge, ratification, authorization and approval of each of the other DEFENDANTS.

7. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and alleges, that each of the DEFENDANTS named in this complaint, including Does 1 through 100, inclusive, is, and at all times mentioned was, the agent, servant and/or employee of each of the other DEFENDANTS and that each DEFENDANT was acting within the course of scope of his, her or its authority as the agent, servant and/or employee of each of the other DEFENDANTS. Consequently, all of the DEFENDANTS are jointly and severally liable to the PLAINTIFF CLASS for the damages sustained as a proximate result of their conduct.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 8. This court has jurisdiction over this action under the Class Action Fairness Act (28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)) because the matter in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest and costs; the P LAINTIFF CLASS are California residents; and the DEFENDANT is a Delaware corporation.
- 9. Venue is proper in this court under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(a) -(c) because DEFENDANT is subject to personal jurisdiction in this district, and because a substantial part of the events and omissions giving rise to the PLAINTIFF'S and CLASS' claims occurred in this district.

CLASS DEFINITION

10. The PLAINTIFF CLASS (the CLASS) consists of the following persons:

"All California residents whose telephone calls to Ti me Warner Cable were recorded by Time Warner without their consent from January 27, 2010 to the present."

CLASS TREATMENT

- of all of them is impracticable, and the disposition of their c laims will benefit the parties and the Court. PLAINTIFF'S claim is typical of the claims of the CLASS that PLAINTIFF seeks to represent. The PLAINTIFF will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the CLASS that he seeks to represent. The PLAINTIFF does not have any interests antagonistic to the CLASS that he seeks to represent. PLAINTIFF'S counsel are experienced, qualified and generally able to conduct complex class-action litigation.
- 12. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a class action under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (28 U.S.C.) because:
 - (A) The questions of law and fact common to the CLASS predominate over any question affecting only individual members;
 - (B) A class action is superior to any other a vailable method for the fair and efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the CLASS;
 - (C) The members of the CLASS are so numerous that it is impractical to bring all members of the CLASS before the Court;
 - (D) PLAINTIFF, and the other members of the CLASS, will not be able to obtain effective and economic legal redress unless the action is maintained as a class action;

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- (E) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable relief for the common-law and statutory violations and other improprieties, and in obtaining adequate compensation for the damages and injuries for which DEFENDANT is responsible in an amount sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the CLASS for the injuries sustained;
- (F) Without CLASS certification, the prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the CLASS would create a risk of:
 - (i) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the CLASS that would establish incompatible standards of conduct for DEFENDANT TIME WARNER CABLE LLC. and/or
 - (ii) Adjudications with respect to the individual members that would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other members not parties to the adjudications, or would substantially impair or impede their to protect their ⁻ interests. but not limited to the potential for exhausting the funds available from those parties who are, be, responsible may DEFENDANTS.

THE CONDUCT

- 13. DEFENDANT TIME WARNER CABLE LLC. ("TIME WARNER") owns and operates cable television systems in the state of California.
- 14. TIME WARNER offers cable television services to subscribers in the state of California. As part of it business, TIME WARNER operates call centers for customer service and new subscribers.
- 15. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and alleges, that TIME WARNER'S call centers have recorded every telephone call he received from customers and potential customers during the time from January 27, 2010 to the present (the CLASS PERIOD.)

- 16. On about February 6, 2010, PLAINTIFF MIGUEL CALZADA made a telephone call to a TIME WARNER call center to order a pay-per-view program. He was not told that the call was being, or might be recorded, and did not consent to the call being recorded.
- 17. PLAINTIFF MIGUEL CALZADA intended and understood that his telephone call with the TIME WARNER call center would be confidential.
- 18. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes that the call center intentionally recorded Mr. CALZADA'S call without his consent.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION FOR INVASION OF PRIVACY UNDER PENAL CODE SECTION 632 (PENAL CODE SECTIONS 632 AND 637.2) (By the PLAINTIFF CLASS and against DEFENDANT)

- 19. PLAINTIFF realleges and incorporates by reference, as though fully set forth, paragraphs 1 through 18 of this complaint.
- 20. Penal Code section 632 prohibits "persons," including entities such as TIME WARNER, from intentionally recording a confidential communication by means of an electronic recording device without the consent of all parties.
- 21. Under Penal Code section 637.2, the PLAINTIFF and each CLASS member are entitled to recover three times their actual damages, or \$5,000, whichever is greater, for each confidential communication that TIME WARNER recorded in violation of Penal Code section 632.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment as follows:

- 1. ON THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:
 - A. For compensatory damages, according to proof;
 - B. For general damages, according to proof;
 - C. For an amount equal to up to three times each CLASS member's actual damages, but not less than \$5,000 for each CLASS member; and

1	D. For attorney's fees.
2	E. For costs of suit;
3	F. For prejudgment interest; and
4	G. For other and further relief this court deems just and proper.
5	
6	Dated: April 1, 2011 ARIAS OZZELLO & GIGNAC LLP
7	D 10
8	By: MIKE ARKS
9	MARK OZZELLO
10	David R. Greifinger LAW OFFICES OF DAVID R.
11	GREIFINGER
12	Attorneys for Plaintiff
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL Plaintiff demands a jury trial for all issues triable by jury. (FED. RULES CIV.PROC., RULE 38, 28 U.S.C.) ARIAS OZZELLO & GIGNAC LLP Dated: April 1, 2011 By: David R. Greifinger LAW OFFICES OF DAVID R. **GREIFINGER** Attorneys for Plaintiff

Page 8

PROOF OF SERVICE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the State of California, County of Los Angeles. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within suit; my business address is 6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1400, Los Angeles, California 90045.

On April 4, 2011, I served the foregoing document described as: FIRST AMENDED CLASS-ACTION COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES; DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL on the interested parties in this action by sending [] the original [or] [] a true copy thereof [] to interested parties as follows [or] [] as stated on the attached service list:

SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST

√]	BY MAIL (enclosed in a sealed envelope): I deposited the envelopes for mailing in the ordinary course of business at Los Angeles, California. I am "readily familiar" with this firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice, the sealed envelopes are deposited with the U.S. Postal Service that same day in the ordinary course of business with postage thereon fully prepaid at Los Angeles, California.
[]	BY FAX: I hereby certify that this document was served by facsimile delivery on the parties listed herein at their most recent fax number of record in this action from Los Angeles, California.
[]	BY E-MAIL: I hereby certify that this document was served by e-mail delivery on the parties listed herein at their most recent e-mail addresses of record in this action.
[]	BY PERSONAL SERVICE (enclosed in a sealed envelope): I delivered such envelope by hand to the offices of the addressees named herein.
[]	BY EXPRESS MAIL VIA U.S.P.S. FOR NEXT BUSINESS DAY DELIVERY (enclosed in a sealed envelope): I deposited the envelope for mailing in the

(enclosed in a sealed envelope): I deposited the envelope for mailing in the ordinary course of business at Los Angeles, California. I am "readily familiar" with this firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice, the "Express Mail" envelopes are deposited with the U.S. Postal Service that same day in the ordinary course of business with postage thereon fully prepaid at Los Angeles, California.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on April 4, 2011 at Los Angeles, California.

Ashley Hart
Type or Print Name

Signature

SERVICE LIST 1 2 Rachel Feldman Bryan A Merryman WHITE & CASE LLP 3 WHITE AND CASE LLP 633 West Fifth Street Suite 1900 633 W Fifth Street 19th Fl Los Angeles, CA 90071-2007 4 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2007 Telephone: (213) 620-7700 Telephone: (213) 620-7700 Facsimile: (213(452-2329 5 Facsimile: (213) 452-2329 bmerryman@whitecase.com rfeldman@whitecase.com 6 Attorney for Defendant, Attorney for Defendant, Time Warner Cable LLC 7 Time Warner Cable LLC 8 David R. Greifinger, Esq. Howard A. Goldstein, Esq. LAW OFFICES OF HOWARD A. GOLDSTEIN LAW OFFICES OF DAVID R. GREIFINGER 9 13701 Riverside Drive 1801 Ocean Park Blvd. Suite 608 Suite 201 Sherman Oaks, CA 91423 Santa Monica, CA 90405-4924 10 Telephone: (818) 981-1010 Telephone: (310) 452-7923 Facsimile: (818) 981-1311 11 Facsimile: (310) 450-4715 ARIAS OZZELLO & GIGNAC LLP lohag@att.net tracklaw@verizon.net 12 Attorney for Plaintiffs, Attorney for Plaintiffs, Cheryl Baca Cheryl Baca 13 Jaime Calzada Jaime Calzada Miguel Calzada Miguel Calzada 14 Kenneth M. Lipton, Esq. 15 5900 Sepulveda Blvd. Suite 400 16 Van Nuys, CA 91411-2580 Telephone: (818) 780-3562 17 18 Attorney for Plaintiffs, 19 Cheryl Baca Jaime Calzada 20 Miguel Calzada 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28